RED and BLACK

red & black

AN ANARCHIST JOURNAL

MARCH - JUNE No 15 1986.

CONTENTS.

DEAR FRIEND.....p. 3

INTRODUCTION.....p. 6

THE FAILURE OF STATE COMMUNISM.....p.7.
by R. Rocker.

REFLECTION ON THE FOOD CRISIS IN AFRICA.....p.11.
by C. J. Mc Gillion.

AN ANARCHIST CRITIQUE OF TROTSKY AND TROTSKYSM.
by G. Hill.....p. 18.

THE DISCIPLINARY DOVE.....p.37.
by G. Daniel.

PAGES OF SOCIALIST HISTORY.....p.41.
by Tcherkesoff.

Red and Black,

P.O. Box 115.

Enmore. n. s. w.

Australia. 2042.

THE DEAD LINE FOR THE NEXT ISSUE IS 15th of May.

Single copy is $2.00 plus stamp.
Make all cheques out to: J. Grancharoff

READ!

WRITE!

SUPPORT!

RED AND BLACK

BE GENEROUS WITH YOUR MONEY !MAKE RED AND BLACK

A REGULAR ANARCHIST PUBLICATION!

Editor: J.Grancharoff

DEAR FRIEND, (Instead of an editorial).

It is rather tantalizing to publicly express the conversation I had with you but the idea of openly relating to you excites me because our differences can dwell together in unity. In this sense, your tiny ironic smile, a defence mechanism of disagreement, acquires new constructive perspectives. It makes me think.

We had talked of many things, when, at a given point of the conversation, in a sad and subdued voice, you said that anarchism was a discouraging pessimistic idea. It took me by surprise, later on I mused over it and realized that you had reacted against my empirical exposition of the world. The intellectual excursion, so to speak, was not to your palate. It had profaned your dreams, tried to expel many illusions from your intellectual cravings and exiled happiness from your heart. Is it not cruel to live in a world without hopes? But what hopes?

Intrinsically society as it is, is a texture of ideologies, a mutuality of deceptions. Language obscures rather than ellucidates matters. The lips murmur what the heart denies and mind condemns. Personal happiness is schizophrenia and is socially metaphrazed in dialectical propositions to soften the unbearable social contradictions and solve them, in the final analyses, in the synthesis when the unity of appearance and essence is realized. Thus the movement of history is established: the attainment of telos with life subordinate to escatology; delight to the future generations and beauty - to here after.

The ultima Thule, the end of the moribund society, history and social contrtadictions, demands the sacrificial blood of the innocents, the oppressed, the proletariat and the down-throdden. The poor lambs have the satisfaction to be my stified as heroes of a teneberous history, the actors in a ceaseless drama. Nonetheless, those propitiatory offerings are necessary and inevitable steps, here and now, for the elite to live in the sacred precincts of power where socialism is the surplus value and the prolertariat raw material, where the bourgeoisie in red tunics celebraste the harvest of classless society but it labour not. Objectively historical materialism is simply a history where the material goods are scarce, naturally, for those who work; where society is rich in concepts but reality, objectively stated, is the poverty of misery or miserable poverty.

The state withers away by militarizing society and bureaucratizing life. The Guillotine is on the side of progress. The hangman's halter is the merriment of the rebel. But these are the historical necessities, the crimes of which are exonerated because they are committed for the good of humanity, for the liberation of the oppressed, the emancipation of people and for social welbeing, equality, brotherhood and sisterhood.

Vicars of Christ fulminate against sin. A crusade of new-born Christians is in movement, not to mention fundamentalist muslims. The blood of the

innocents is a prerequisite to enter the kingdom of heaven and, on earth, to establish Pax Mundi. Remember the Christian adage: "Love your neighbours as yourself" but kill them as vipers, expecially if they are godless communists. Love is a laudable Christian virtue, that's why they sell you tickets to heaven, one way only. If the righteous live in vice and opulency it is not to be envied (envy is a deadly sin) because it is their last supper whereas eternity belongs to the poor, the starved, the meek in the heart, because it is they who will inherit the life here after. Naturally in the kingdom of shadows there is no life, but a blooming ahadow is preferable to an unbearable existence. After all, belief makes the endurance of oppression a virtue and the chain of slavery a tolerable, if not desirable, destiny. Without chains there is no security, neither is there happiness.

Life is compartmentalized into essence and appearance with a great social repercussions: what is said is not what is meant. The father is dethroned in a storm of words, the dust clouds of which are not yet settled, but he is sublimated into the Realpolitic to be exploited without demur. The mother is rejected and denigrated and then manipulated to harbour in her bosom bitterness and resentment and to administer poison to the spring of life. Hierarchy and patriarchy are detested but what about matriarchy? Why is one archy preferable to another? A dose, I suppose, of conventional wisdom to keep the slaves in their place. Why not an-archy, a society without hierarch, patriarch and matriarch? Brotherhood is chauvinistic conspiracy, while sisterhood is Amazonian fascism niether of which is palatable to a free spirit. The elite is frowned at, but not the avant-garde. The function of the latter is to raise the consciousness of the slaves provided that the slaves remain subordinated to the conceptual visions of their intellectual mentors, be they brothers or sisters. Man is a class enemy to be eliminated, but his sperm preserved in feminist coffers, a pragmatical touch of barbarism, an irony of liberation. Thus, objectively speaking, the noblest sentiments of freedom and emancipation are tainted with bias, and the most laudable emotion of love turned into the venom of hate. Theoretically there is no game but there is always a trump card to tramp people down.

Is such a description a philosophy of pessimism or a philosophy of reality without interpretations? Is it better to circumvent objective symptoms and live on social and doctrinal anti-biotics? Surely power to delude ourselves and others is unlimited but, does it make us free? To side with freedom is to have the courage to face the Gorgon without flinching eyes; to cross the Rubicon:to defy authority and break the armour of our psychological and mental enslavement. Freedom is not a pleasure or a philistine pastime; it is responsibility, creativity and courage. Responsibility is frightening and so the world of mechanization is preferred because the realm of numbers and statistics is safer than the realm of creativity. Also, the tongue of freedom is not honeyed, it is bitter for those socialized souls for whom the world of reality, while naked, is cold and ugly because they only have themselves to identify with.

Freedom is a world without flattery and self-centered love, a world that does not tolerate a ruling class whether proletarian or bourgeois, secular or religious, virtuous or bad, A world where servants refuse to be servants

but do not long to become masters; where pupils do not have teachers but friends and comrades; a world where wife is a memory of the past and husband is a museum relic. A world of equals in the all senses of the word.

So my dear friend, if recognizing reality is pessimism, then freedom is nothing but an illusion. Freedom tomorrow in the after life or at the end of history, as optimistic it may sound, is but a soporific pill for here and now enchained reality. After all we are not abstract concepts to serve the purpose of history, philosophy, religion or the party's politics and to be desposed of at will, we are human beings. Pessimism is the way to divest humans and disentangle the social and personal from ideological contents, to see the concatenation of circumstances which determine our existence and thus, if necessary, to open vistas of liberation, the expanse of a world without illusions, veils, deceptions and character anchorage. Pessimism is an understanding of human existence that is not envoeloped in personal, social and political trammels, an existence without tears and sentimentality. If pessimism states the case as it is, it does not entail either a free society or liberation. But if I have chosen freedom as an ideal, and the approximation to that ideal as a way of life, then pessimism makes me aware that reification of freedom implies a rejection of authority, gods, idols, commissars and avant-gardes; in other words, a rejection of hierarchies at all possible levels. If this is pessimism that I am pessimist and, therefore, an an-archist.

Seeing reality, in tough empirical terms, does not imply either pessimism or optimism. It simply states the facts withour make-up, veil and ideology. If this is pessimismj, because free of illusions and optimistic colours reality is revealed as unpalatable, intolerable and unbearable existence, then pessimism is a positive contribution to an understanding of ourselves and the ecology or our existence. While "seeing" is not doing, it is, nevertheless, a necessary prerequisite for those who are interested in transcending the conditions of their poverty and breaking the chains of their slavery.

If as you assume "conceiving a reality without oppression" (I refer to is as the ideal) is optimism then the way to it - sweat, tears and blood - is pessimism. But the ideal converges with the real at the point of its existential import. It is at this level that the ideal is humanized or dehumanized; liberation is verified or falsified, asserted or refuted. Thus, it is in the materialization of the dream that our humanity is either enriched and freedom acquires its meaning, or, it is impoverished and freedom denied. The road to "reality without oppression", is not a pleasant dream but ungrateful task and a test of endurance. I see nothing optimistic in it .but harsh empirical travail Living is a paradox of absurdities and optimism a glossy cover.

To have a vision of a free, egalitarian and classless society is fine optimism, but to think that history is on the side of such society is an illusion long time refuted by cold historical facts. More, to force history to serve optimism by eliminating and subjugating humans is a crime. Such opptim ism is glorification of hecatombs, fixation on corpses, veneration of the monuments of the victorious, idolization of militarism and a support to tyranny.

Woe to those who are offered to the altar of uniformity, regimentation and monohappiness to pave the way for the greater glory of classless society, the happiness of future generations and optimism.

Thus if pessimism tears the mask of oppressions, of prejudicess, exposes the fallacy of idols, gods and authority, and opens the floodgate of the dammed energy of life so that it follows its natural course, then I am pessimist. It is in such a pessimism that the materialization of my freedom and individual growth are possible since it is living a life without illusions. Tough empirical reality, but necessary, if freedom is to be realized and a society without oppression and deceptions materialized.

With love:

Jack.

Introduction

It seems that Red and Black suffers from an endemic desease: a permanency of articles dealing with the same topics. Nonetheless the emphasis changes.

Rocker, in The Failure of State Communism, sketches the nefarious role of the state in the revolutionary praxis. The function of the state qua state is to oppress, regulate, regiment, exploit and to perpetuate its own power. The Bolshevik state is not an exception. Instead of eliminating class distinction, it has created a new class ,the commissariocracy. Like all states it is on the side of oppression and, also, it lay down the foundation of what later on was referred to as a totalitarian state.

C.J. Mc Gillion, in his: Reflection on the food crisis in Africa, while graphicly describing the African plight rightly puts the blame on capitalism, the I.M.F. and the World Bank. Their priorities are "stabilisation" which, in real terms, means dependency syndrome in economic and political spheres rather than general growth and thus ignores "the real causes of the Thirld World interests". The governments of individual countries are also to blame because military pursuits, power preservation and extension are more important than the poverty and suffering of the people.

G. Hill continues to demystify Trotsky, to expose his Machiavellian tactics and the red terror as revolutionary weapons. It was Lenin and Trotsky who begot Stalin. In the Astrakhan's massacres Trotsky's laconic statement: "Give no quarter" sealed the fate of thoudands people and provided Stalin with an excellent weapon:"Give no quarter", which he later on used against all his enemies, including Trotsky himself and all varieties of Trotskyites. Stalin was, in a sense, a Trotskyist or perhaps, Trotsky a Stalinist, depending on your interpretation of the Bible.

Tcherkesoff in his: Pages of Socialist History,deals this time with Marx's misrepresentation of various people and more precisely with J.S.Mill. Marx being on the side of the state as against the individual, on the side of the organized labour army later known as labour conscripts or,plainly, as forced labour, as opposed to the free association of the productive forces, could not tolerate people like J.S. Mill. The interesting aspect is that it was J.S.Mill, the bourgeois, who first suported " the idea of parliamentary candidatures of the proletariat as a class". Are the Marxists of today bourgeois deviationists?

The Failure of State Communism

CHAPTER VIII

The Nature of the state.

A few months before the outburst of the Revolution, Lenin wrote his famous book State and Revolution, a strange mixture of Marxist and conspicuous anarchist ideas. By carefully chosen statements he tried to establish that Marx and Engels had always preached the suppression of the state and that they proposed to use the state during the transitional period only, when society passes from capitalism to socialism. At the same time in a most vigorous manner he had attacked Kautsky, Piekhanov and others whom he branded as "opportunists" of modern Marxist socialism because they willfully falsified the teaching of the two masters, that is, hid from the workers their concept of the state and its role in the process of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is not necessary to examine Lenin's affirmations in depth since many of his arguments are far fetched hypotheses. It would not be difficult to oppose such a crop of quotations from Marx and Engels with others proving quite the opposite, but such commentaries of general nature are not important. The point at issue is not what Marx and others have said and written in their life-times, but what has been affirmed and refuted by practical experiments. That, and only that, is important while the rest, in depth, is equivalent to those famous statements which the astute theologians used in the Apocalypse.

In The State and Revolution Lenin clearly stated that the difference between Marxists and Anarchists consists in the fact that "the former, while aiming at the complete abolition of the state, recognize that this aim can only be achieved after classes have been abolished by the socialist revolution as a result of the establishement of socialism, which leads to the withering of the state. The latter want to abolish the state completely overnight, not understanding the conditions under which the state can be abolished."

This statement prompted many anarchists to find in Lenin and his party close comrades in struggle, while many others accepted the bargain of the famous "dictatorship of the proletariat" as an inevitable and transitional form in the interest of the revolution. They did not, or could not, understand that it was precisely the idea of the necessity of the dictatorship as inevitable transitional phase that was the greatest danger.

Commissariocracy; the new class.

To affirm the necessity of the State as long as classes are not suppressed implies a particular concept. It means the State is not itself generating new classes and is not essentially an embodiment and perpetrator of class differences. History confirms the opposite, Nonetheless, this concept was, for the first time, put into practice by the Bolshevik experiment in Russia and not to be able to see the consequences is to be stricken by incurable blindness. In fact under "the dictatorship of the proletariat" a new class has developed in Russia, the commissariocracy, which the majority of the people accept and consider as oppressive as the representatives of the old regime. In fact, the commissariocracy lead the same useless and parasitic existence as their predecessors did in tsarist Russia: they have accepted the best houses and supplies while the masses of the people continue to suffer hunger and terrible poverty. Furthermore, they have extended the tyrannical tendencies of the old regime to the point that that tyranny has become as a nightmare burdening the people. Thus to describe the real situation in Lenin's empire a new term has been coined in common parlance:"the soviet bourgeoisie." This term, currently employed by the Russian workers, indicates clearly what people think of the yoke imposed on them by this new caste of masters who hold power in their name.

In the face of these cruel facts Lenin's assertion that the State will continue to exist only as long as classes e , is simply a bad joke. In reality, the powerful apparatus of the State is creating new privileges and is protecting the old ones. This is the function and the content of its being, be it under tsarism or under "the dictatorship of the proletariat". Just as there cannot be found grapes on thistles, so an instrument of class domination and manipulation cannot be transformed into an instrument of people's liberation.

In his brilliant essay on the modern state, Kropotkin made the following important remarks: "One who appeals to an institution, already a historical product, to destroy the privileges it itself has helped to develop, confesses his inability to understand what a historical product in the life of society means. He fails to understand the fundamental rule of organic nature, that

any new function demands new organs and that they reproduce themselves. Also, by this, he acknowledges that he is a very lazy spirit and too timorous to think of the new road opened up by new developments.

These words express one of the most important truths of our times and, at the same time, denounce one of the most serious intellectual disease from which human culture suffers today.

In social life, institutions have similar functions to the organs of animals and plants, they are the organs of the social body. They are not an arbitrary product but a certain necessity of the environment. For example, the eye of a fish in deep waters is not constituted similarly to that of land animals, because it responds to different exigencies. Different living conditions create different organs, but the organs accomplish a definite function for which they have been developed and then die out slowly, becoming rudimentary, since the body no longer demands their functions. No organ takes over a function if it does not correspond to its nature.

The birth of the Modern State.

This is true of the social institutions too. They are not created arbitrarily but are a product of precise social necessities and have definite scopes. The modern state had appeared when class divisions and the monopoly economy made inroads into the bosom of the old social order. The new property owning class (needed an instrument of power to maintain their economic and social privileges over the masses. Thus was born and had developed the modern state: an organ of class privileges to keep the masses in their state of inferiority and oppression. This was its essential task and only reason for its existence. It remains faithful to it since it can not be otherwise, unless it is not going to be itself any longer. Naturally its forms have changed during historical evolution but its function has remained the same. It has expanded to the extent that more sectors of social life are subjugated to its power. However, whether it is called a republic or a monarchy, or is organized on the base of a constitution or authocracy, its historical mission does not change. Just as one cannot arbitrarily change the functions of body organs of animals or plants, for example, one cannot at will hear with eyes or see with ears, so one cannot transform an organ of oppression into an organ of liberation of the oppressed. The state can only be what it is. The state is nothing other than the defender of privileges and the perpetrator of the exploitation of the masses; a generator of new classes and new monopolies. One who fails to understand this role of the state does not actually understand the nature of social order and, thus, will be incapable of indicating to mankind new horizons of development.

The Bolsheviks who set up the "dictatorship of the proletariat" not only captured the old state apparatus, but were able to perfect it to an extent unknown to the other governments of the world. All public life became subservient to it and all economic organization was put in its hands. They pitilessly suppressed those who hindered them, all mass sentiment and

thinking was eliminated and thus they have created the most formidable bureaucracy the world has ever known. The famous motto of the Jacobin, Saint-Juste, that the task of a legislator is to eliminate all private consciousness and to teach the citizen to think in conformity to the reason of the state, has never, until the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in Russia, acquired such a reality. Any opinion contrary to the dictator's has been, for years, suffocated, all technical means of expression are lacking, and only what is written in support of the reason of the Bolshevik state is transmitted to the people by the state press.

In his well known thesis on the "Bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat" Lenin tries to justify the suppression of the freedom of assemblies in Russia, by reference to the English and French Revolutions during which the monarchist elements were no longer permitted to organize publicly and to express any opinions. This reference serves to camouflage real facts. In England, as well as in France, the young republic was in a life and death struggle with its monarchist adversaries. That it was forced by this struggle to go out of its way to suppress, by any means, its notorious enemies was quite understandable and justifiable due to the fact that it was dictated by the most elementary imperative of self-defence. It is different in Russia, where not only the followers of the old regime are repressed but also all revolutionary and socialist tendencies, whose followers had helped to overthrow the authocracy and who had risked their lives opposing counter-revolutionary tendencies. This is the important difference which Lenin conceals wilfully so as not to antagonize his followers outside Russia.(Unless they are Germans. He has nothing to fear from them - they supported him and his military order.)

The same can be said about all his declarations about the freedom of the press. When, for example, he affirms in the same thesis that "the alleged freedom in democratic states is a deception in so far as the best printing shops and the most important stocks of paper are in the hands of the capitalists" he is missing the point. This opinion of freedom of the press in the capitalist state is in fact a banal truth that every socialist has understood for a long time. On the other hand, he says nothing of Russia, where the existing conditions of the revolutionary and socialist press are a thousand times worse than in any capitalist state. It is true that in a capitalist state the capitalists own the best printing shops and the most paper-stock but, in Communist Russia, it is the state that owns all printing shops and all paper, thus being in a position to stifle any opnion, that is, not only that of the reactionaries but, also, that of authentic revolutionaries and socialists who fail to please its representatives. Well, that is the point. At the time of of the English and French Revolutions while all reactionary written and oral expressions were prohibited that was not the case of the various revolutionary tendencies, even if the latter, often, were not to the taste of the government. It is here that Lenin's explanations circumvent the issue itself and, concealing precisely the important point, lead to error.

In capitalist states, the free expression of written and spoken opinions are naturally reduced a lot, but in Russia, under the alleged "dictatorship of the proletariat", they do not exist at all. That is the difference. The result? A complete failure by the dictatorship to prepare for and realize

socialism and a surrender, without hope, to capitalism: the very thing they wanted to destroy.

(to be continued)

Reflections on the Food Crisis in Africa

Over the past two years increasing international attention has been addressed to the plight of the victims of Africa's current famine. Relief efforts, while still predominantly and necessarily concerned with the immediate needs of the millions at risk in Africa, are now beginning to focus on the requirements of long-term recovery. The task is formidable. Put bluntly Africa can no longer feed itself. A World Bank report issued in September 1984 warned of the prospect of a political, social and economic "nightmare" in Africa by the turn of the century. Sadly that nightmare is already a reality for much of the continent. More tragically the efforts being addressed to it promise little, if indeed any, long-term relief. This paper outlines the extent of the food crisis in Africa. It analyses the factors that have contributed to that crisis and reviews briefly programs intended to address the problem.

A two day UN sponsored conference on the current crisis in Africa held last March identified nine African countries most critically affected by the drought. These were: Angola, Mozambique, Burkino Faso, Niger, Chad, Mali, Sudan, Ethiopia and Mauritania. In addition eleven countries were listed as critically affected: Botswana, Cape Verde, Kenya, Burundi, Lesotho, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In all one-fifth - 30 million - of the 150 million inhabitants of drought affected Africa were said to be confronting famine. 10 million of these had left their homes in search of food and water. The overall extent of the crisis varied in individual countries. Twenty-five percent of the populations of Ethiopia and Sudan faced famine. In Rwanda the figure was fifty-five percent; in Mauritania as high as seventy percent. To February 1985 the death toll in Ethiopia alone was estimated at 500,000.

The rains that fell from March were cruelly discriminating. Zimbabwe, Zambia and Angola fared reasonably well. Rain in Ethiopia and the western regions of Sudan brought short-term problems of flooding, disrupting communications and interrupting the distribution of relief supplies of food. No rain fell in the Sahel. Botswana, where eighty percent of the population requires relief, is now in its fourth unbroken year of drought.

Drought aside, however, food production in Africa is failing to feed the continent's population. 150 million Africans suffer from some form of malnutrition. Over the past 20 years only in Africa has food production failed to keep pace with population growth. Sub-Saharan Africa for the period 1961-3 imported a total 1.6 million metric tonnes of food in the form of aid or commercial sales. In 1981 it imported 8.8 million metric tonnes. In comparison, for the same period, Asian imports rose from 17.1 to 36.4 million metric tonnes - a proportionately much smaller increase. Throughout the 1970's food imports to Africa increased annually by around 8.4 percent. For the continent generally agriculture has declined markedly as a percentage of GDP since the 1960's. In Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan food production has declined consistently each year for a decade. According to an FAO index of per capita food production the average African now consumes ten percent less locally produced food compared with ten years ago.(1)

Individual regimes bear much of the responsibility for the catastrophe befalling their populations. The revolutionary government of Ethiopia's Mengistu Haile Mariam, for instance, fighting rebels in Eritrea, Tigre and the Ogaden, not only commits 1/2 of its budget to the military but is said to be in debt to the Soviet Union for military supplies to the extent of a further $US3 billion. It maintains an army of 300,000;drafting 60,000 through 1984 alone. The regime is reported to have napalmed crops in rebel areas, to have spent $US250 million on its 10th anniversary celebrations in 1984, and a further $US750,000 on the OAU's December 1984 Conference liquor bill alone. At the same time it calls for urgent famine relief from the international community and is the focus of much of its current attention. In other cases governments possess the resources but lack the will to adopt soil conservation programs or to deal effectively with the corruption that is endemic in many countries and which frustrates both local production and the distribution of foreign aid. Development projects which are decidedly unsuitable to local conditions continue to be pursued in the interests of certain sections of the population or in vain and quite often disastrous attempts to enhance regional and international prestige.

Beyond such specific indictments however it is possible to identify more general reasons for the collapse of Africa's rural base. Some of these reasons derive from the colonial legacy bequeathed to the continent. Others lie in the development strategies pursued - some might say ignored - by most African governments themselves. Nevertheless, and increasingly, a major role in Africa's food crisis is being played by Western industrial economies and the multilateral agencies that essentially pursue their interests. Together these factors can be linked to what is becoming an endemic cycle of drought and famine throughout so much of the region.

Colonialism significantly distorted the traditional political economy of Africa. Artificial political boundaries were created to accommodate the imperialist claims of European powers rather than to reflect established tribal groupings or relatively autonomous natural environments. A relationship of dependency to industrialized Europe was established whereby African

colonies became suppliers of primary commodities in exchange for the manufactured products of the colonising economies. To this end communal ownership patterns were dismantled where they presented an obstacle to "efficient" production and traditional patterns of exploiting land and other raw materials were adjusted to the new relationship. African colonial economies, increasingly geared to export, developed an infrastructural network designed to facilitate the satisfaction of overseas markets rather than to promote a general and sustained development.

Perhaps the most significant expression of this process is to be seen in the practice of cash-cropping. Productive land was appropriated by European expatriates and cultivated to service the demands of overseas industries and appetites. Intensive agricultural production was introduced to soils largely unsuitable to this purpose leaving a long-term legacy of soil damage and long-term reliance on pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers. Forests were destroyed, and with them the natural protection against erosion and leaching, to make more land available for cash-crops. This pattern of land use, and the more general 'development' strategy it expressed having thus been established under colonial administrators, was one essentially unchallenged by post-colonial governments.

Development funds allocated by post-colonial governments essentially neglected, and still neglect, rural production. Investment has been directed to the construction of showpieces, - public buildings, conference centres, airlines - to inappropriate large scale industrial plants, or to commodity export related infrastructure. By implication if not design urban areas have attracted funds thus promoting a population drift from rural areas. Given the labour intensive methods of agricultural production throughout much of the continent this drift has encouraged a proportionate decline in rural output. African governments still, on average, spend less than 10 percent of their budgets on agriculture. At the same time millions of tonnes of grain are destroyed annually for want of sufficient pesticides and storage facilities. Shortfalls were met throughout the 1960's by imports made cheap by world surpluses, but which also, in many cases, undercut local production. During the 1970's, with world grain prices rising dramatically, 20 percent of the people in sub-saharan Africa remain dependent on food imports.

Meeting these and other import requirements has been costly. African countries have met that cost essentially through primary commodity exports. But the prices paid on world markets for primary commodities have been consistently declining. Third World economies need generally to compete for access to Northern markets and this competition ensures that prices are kept low. Further, demand for Third World primary products in the North is inelastic. Increasing production consequently leads not to increases in consumption but to a drop in price. Over time, then, more and more has to be exported merely to keep pace with the levels of returns once made.

Primary product marketing strategies of some developed countries, moreover, further exacerbated this situation. The EEC, in particular, has been accused of stabilising its prices for primary products by transferring instability onto Third World producers. EEC surpluses are stored and con-

tinued production encouraged through subsidised payments until such time as the goods are dumped on world markets. This process not only depresses further select commodity prices, it forces Third World producers to turn increasingly to crops that can be expected to return more stable, albeit much lower, prices.

In consequence African governments have become increasingly reliant on Western aid and borrowings from international lenders. Rising interest payments on such loans continue to accentuate the problems associated with repayments. Sudan, for instance, by March 1985, was facing an additional $US10 million interest payment each week on 1984 borrowings. Such a burden has meant an increasing reliance on the further development of cash crops and an increasing submission to the economic adjustment policies of the international financial institutions - particularly the IMF.

Cash cropping, as has been suggested, represents a potentially disastrous addiction but nonetheless one entertained and intensified by post-colonial governments. By 1979 coffee alone accounted for 69 percent of the export earnings of Ethiopia; cotton 65 percent of the export earnings of Sudan. Senegal, in the same year, derived 37 percent of its export earnings from the trade in groundnuts, the production of which occupied 55 percent of the country's arable land.(2) The ecological burdens have likewise accelerated. As more and more land is required for cash crops so forests are razed and, where possible, sold off to timber companies. In the past 25 years the Ivory Coast has lost 1/3 of its forests to timber companies. Land requirements for cash cropping have also forced increasing numbers of people onto marginal lands. This has further diminished forest cover. Ethiopia is now 3 percent forest covered - 20 years ago 16 percent of the country was under forests. One billion tonnes of soil are consequently washed or blown away from the country each year. More generally, this increasingly occupied marginal land on either side of the Sahara provided a natural barrier to desert spread. Heavy cultivation and grazing, however, have prevented regeneration. As a result the Sahara is spreading at the rate of 2 million hectares a year. Mauritania is becoming a dust bowl: its rainfall has fallen off by 90 percent since 1968. Niger's rainfall since that year has declined by 20 percent. Senegal's fell 50 percent from 1973 to 1984.(3)

Simply maintaining some suggestion of economic stability, let alone redressing these ecological problems, has meant more borrowings to meet immediate shortfalls. But such borrowings carry stringent conditions which together have two quite serious consequences. The first is a reduction in export incomes and a corresponding rise in import costs. This inevitably means an even greater reliance on the production of cash crops and other export oriented commodities as well as a continued dependence on overseas finance. Second is the "liberalization" of internal market structures without regard to the disadvantage subsequently experienced by those sections of the population even now least able to cope.

Seventy percent of all IMF packages now require foreign exchange adjustment. Somalia, to secure a recent $US54.7 million IMF loan, devalued

its shilling by 50 percent and then a further 40 percent. A 48 percent devaluation of the Sudanese currency against the US dollar in February this year fell short of IMF demands. Since increasingly World Bank borrowings, and even direct government to government loans, require the recipient's accommodation with the IMF, more and more African governments are forced to adopt such policies and weather the storm of internal dissent if, and however, they can. Sudan's President Numieri was ousted in April 1985 largely as a result of the austerity measures his regime was forced to comply with through the combined pressures of Washington and the IMF. The new regime of General Siwar al Dahab, though voicing its concern to closely scrutinize its ties with the IMF has agreed nonetheless to adhere to its prescriptions.

The IMF also requires wage freezes, credit control and the removal of government subsidies in the interests of market forces. Furthermore, as an incentive to local producers, internal prices are required to be raised regardless of the combined effects on large, poor sections of the population. IMF policies have been criticized as:

> designed to measure development and creditworthiness in discredited, mainline capitalist terms. Policies that the IMF imposes on developing countries as a prerequisite for obtaining a loan often may make it more difficult for the poor to obtain an adequate diet and therefore have a negative impact on nutritional status and health.(4)

By championing the market the IMF is effectively promoting an equilibrium which fails to incorporate those people who lack the purchasing power to meet their needs. To appreciate the substantive effect one need only compare the life expectancy of an Indian which is on average 15 years less than that of a Chinese where the distribution of food and other basic necessities are state - not market - controlled.

The debt burden on Afrcan economies is proportionately greater than that anywhere else in the world. While Latin Amercan debt represents 46 percent of the continent's GNP the corresponding figure for Africa is 58 percent. Meeting this debt means that African governments are increasingly vulnerable to the economic policy straightjackets which the demands of the IMF and those that champion its principles represent. Vice-President Bush, at the March UN conference on the African emergency, was severely criticized by Tanzania's President Nyrere for suggesting that Africa's economic redemption lay in removing price restrictions in order to boost competition. For Nyrere the "pathetic backwardness" of African agriculture was the much more serious consideration.

The Lagos Plan of Action adopted by the OAU in 1980 (and subsequently eclipsed by events in emergent Zimbabwe and southern Africa generally) was one attempt to confront such backwardness. More funds were to be diverted to agriculture and directions taken toward regional economic integration and collective self-reliance. In a significant departure from its

1981 Report on Africa the World Bank even conceded, from 1982, that internal development would be limited while foreign aid remained essentially directed to the interests of the donor and while African commodities continued to face difficulties in international markets. But neither this promising indigenous initiative nor the concessions of the World Bank have resulted in encouraging reforms. Indeed the World Bank, despite its rhetoric, continues to press for export-oriented recovery, for changes in food pricing and exchange rates, and for the promotion of economic competition rather than cooperation.

Cooperation from the West has also been lacking. Increasingly US aid has served quite open military and security interests and the diminishing economic aid which is given - primarily to client states - reinforces an encouragement of the private sector regardless of the needs thereby ignored. Much the same is true of present British aid: again declining in volume by 3 percent in 1985 over 1984; again increasingly tied to British political, industrial and commercial interests; again underemphasising the needs of African agriculture.

Identifying the solutions to Africa's agricultural dilemma is much more difficult. Some critics point to the aid policies of Western donors, and in particular their neglect of the poor, to the prescriptions of the IMF, and to the unequal terms of international trade in outlining alternative strategies for Africa. But higher prices are unlikely to be won for African (or more generally Third World) exports. The IMF is unlikely to alter its economic adjustment requirements. The nature of major Western aid packages is unlikely to change. This reflects the distribution of power in the international system and the influence that certain interests wield within that power structure. Other critics suggest that if Africa is to avoid a spiral into even greater abject poverty and economic and environmental disaster the impetus must come from African governments themselves, in concert, and without the interference of the West. It is essential, it is argued, that cooperation to redress environmental deterioration and to develop a strategy for land utilization that aims toward regional self-sufficiency in food be forthcoming. Against these suggestions, however, lie the very real divisions within and between African governments - divisions which are encouraged by outside powers seeking to preserve neo-imperial domains.

A greater solidarity among African governments on the issue of debt is not, however, beyond the realms of possibility and its effects could be far reaching. Latin American governments have become increasingly reluctant to sacrifice their interests to placate the demands of the IMF. Those interests, moreover, are diverse. The preservation of fragile democratic institutions and the maintenance of internal order are two concerns which can produce unlikely bedfellows. Confronted with the possibility of a collective Latin American debt revolt the Reagan Administration has recently moved to expand the role of the World Bank - and restrict that of the IMF - in helping debtors repay while simultaneously pursuing the goal of long-term growth. The Bank's lending limits are to be relaxed and its priorities re-

ordered to encourage basic structural changes, including the diversification of industrial and agricultural bases. While these efforts are primarily addressed to Latin America a companion program for the poorest Third World economies, particularly in Africa, is also under development. The achievement of a common position on this issue by African governments could help ensure the adoption of this program and perhaps shape its substance, albeit within an existing relationship of economic and financial dependency. Such a position may nevertheless encourage further efforts toward collective arrangements among African countries as it has to a limited extent amongst Latin American countries such as Mexico and Brazil.

It must be remembered that the World Bank in any case accepts the premises and the priorities of the IMF. "Stabilisation", not sustained and general growth let alone the interests of the poor, remains the primary goal to which its major activities are addressed. Moreover given the considerable influence excercised by the US on its loan decisions, and the current Administration's tendency to ignore the root causes of Third World unrest, it is unlikely to depart from its established hostility to radical or even reformist adjustments within Third Economies. That such adjustments are needed in Africa and elsewhere is obvious. That in most cases the will to make them is wanting is also obvious. Nevertheless, and despite the very real difficulties, perhaps the most effective assistance progressive organisations in the West can make to Africa's rehabilitation is to support financially and politically those forces in Africa committed to reform.

NOTES:

1. See, for instance, J.W.Mellor, "Food Aid: Reflections on a Decade of Action", Food and Nutrition,10,1,1984 and Charles Ebel, "Africa's Failing Agriculture: Battling the Odds", Africa News, Feb. 25, 1985.
2. Barbara Dinham and Colin Hines, Agribusiness in Africa, London, 1985, 187.
3. "The Politics of Starvation", Arabia:The Islamic World Review, Feb. 1985,40
4. Michael C.Latham, "Strategies for the control of malnutrition and the influence of nutritional sciences", Food and Nutrition,10,1,1984,30.

FREEDOM IS AN ABSENCE OF MASTER

An Anarchist Critique of

Trotsky & Trotskysm

In the previous chapters, Bolshevik repression of the peasants was examined, and the authoritaran nature of their role in military and economic affairs between 1917 and 1920 was also dealt with. In this chapter, I deal with the relationship between Trotsky, the Bolshevik government, the soviets, and the working class between 1917 and 1920, and conclude the chapter with an example of how Bolshevik harshness, far from saving the revolution, nearly caused a final defeat.

CHAPTER 5

Most historians, when dealing with working class upheavals against the Bolsheviks in 1921, see the causes in terms of the severely dislocated economy and its hardships. This situation is usually presented as being made worse by contact between the once loyal industrial workers and the rebellious peasantry. The peasant mentality supposedly infected the workers at a time when they were demoralized, and led them, whatever their intentions, into counter-revolutionary activity.

This at first glance seems plausible. Peasant rebellions had preceded the 1921 events. The economy was a cause for discontent, and there was increasing contact between peasants and city dwellers at this time. However, this idea is shown to be incorrect when other facts are brought into consideration.

First there are the aims and slogans of these rebels: they wanted a return to the aims of the 1917 revolution, not a white guard victory. Most of the 1921 rebels were veterans of the campaigns against the white guards. Second there is the point that the peasants were not inherently counter-revolutionary. If they were, they would have backed the white guards, and as the peasants numbered between 80% and 90% of Russia's population, a white guard victory would have been inevitable. The politically committed peasantry were divided between supporting the red, white and green armies. A large proportion, perhaps a majority, lacked any political commitment, and wanted to be left alone to earn their living. They usually disliked, and probably did not understand, the political figures who came from outside their area, and when those tried to take their food and possessions and con-

script them, they would fight back, regardless of what uniform the strangers wore. Apart from the Makhno, Antonovite and Petlura movements, the peasant rebels do not seem to have had more than a provincial outlook or to have made alliances with the city dwellers.

A third reason to view the working class rebels as an autonomous revolutionary force is that their first disagreements and conflicts with the Bolsheviks pre-date the first peasant rebellions.

In early 1917 even before the Bolsheviks seized power, the first incident started. There was some friction when minor harassment and slanderous attacks on other left wing working class parties began. Then between March and May 1917, there were several conflicts when the Bolsheviks tried to dominate the Kronstadt soviet. They were told off when they tried to take the credit for organizing Kronstadt's role in the February Revolution. Then they intrigued to overthrow a decision made by soviet delegates although the Bolshevik motion had been defeated, thirty-six votes to one hundred and thirty-eight. A major Bolshevik leader at Kronstadt, Semion Roshal, was excluded from the soviet for his manipulations in this affair(7). His concluding defence statement was a moment of rare Bolshevik honesty:"I cannot do violence to my deep convictions; as long as power is not in our hands we will not rest."(7:61)

There would soon be another similar incident. The Kronstadt soviet declared itself an independent authority in opposition to Kerensky without Lenin's permission. Lenin summoned Raskalnikof, a leading Bolshevik to "please explain", and warned him that such a course was utopian and a breach of elementary party discipline:"For such things we shall shoot people!" (15:94)

This was in May 1917, six months before the Bolsheviks seized power. At this time, in public, Lenin was continually raising the slogans of "all power to the soviets" and "abolish the death penality", and denounced middle-class radicals who meddled in workers' affairs:

> All these gentry while playing a great, very often a predominant role in parliamentary work and in the journalism of the party, reject outright the dictatorship of the proletariat and a policy of unconcealed opportunism.(12:100)

Yet Raskalnikov's eyewitness account, Kronstadt and Petrograd in 1917, quite candidly gives many examples of Lenin trying to secretly manipulate the Kronstadt soviet through his Bolshevik lieutenants stationed there.

The Kronstadters and the Petrograd workers were not unaware of this aspect of Bolshevism, The Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917 had been followed by a proposed general strike in which Petrograd was disrupted when Menshevik-dominated railway and communication unions opposed the monopoly of power by the supposed workers' government. (19:314; 335-6) (15:308; 324-5).

At the same time some Kronstadters protested at this monopoly (22:459-463).

From this time till the 1921 rebellion there would be a series of arguments between non-Bolsheviks and Bolsheviks within Kronstadt on how the Kronstadt soviet would be run. When decisions went against Bolshevik wishes, trouble with the central government usually resulted.

Unrest and repression were common, and crushed more violently in Petrograd and other industrial centres. By early 1920 strikers were being shot regularly. (13:43; 135-140) (2:139) (3:89) A few months earlier, there occurred three strike-breaking massacres which, if they had been organized by Czar Nicholas or Henry Frick would have become household names - in the way Bloody Sunday 1905 and the 1892 Homestead Strike have passed into folk memory.

The first of these incidents was the series of massacres at Astrakhan in the spring of 1919, which directly involved Trotsky. On March 1, work stopped in the Astrakhan factories in protest against the high workloads, minimal rations and endless queuing for these rations. As in Petrograd in February 1917, those queuing became impatient and voiced their demands and were forcibly dispersed, not with whips and rifle volleys fired over their heads like the Czar's vicious cavalrymen, but with heavy artillery and machine guns. Here are two accounts, one by the Bolshevik in command during the massacre, the second by a survivor:

> March 10, 1919, 10 a.m., the workers of the factories "Vulkan" and "Kavkaz and Merkuriy", following the alarm signal of the factory sirens, stopped work and began holding meetings. The demand of the authorities to disperse was met with refusal. It was then that we fulfilled our revolutionary duty by using arms..
>
> K. Mekhonoshin.

> Ten thousand workers peacefully assembled at that gigantic rally were discussing the distressing material situation. Soon the meeting was surrounded by machine gunners, sailors and grenade throwers. The refusal of the workers to disperse was met with a volley of rifle shots. That was followed by the rattling of the machine guns aimed directly at the compact human mass of workers and by the deafening explosions of the hand grenades.
>
> The mass of workers wavered, shrunk back and fell into an awe-stricken silence. The rattling of the machine gun smothered the groans of the wounded and the agonizing cries of the mortally striken victims.
>
> And then this human mass surged forward and with one irresistible sweep broke through the barrier of government troops, running, scattering into every direction, frantically seeking cover from the machine gun bullets. Many of the workers were cornered and shot down on the spot. The site of the recent peaceful meeting was now strewn with corpses. Among the bodies of workers writhing

in death agony, could also be seen the bodies of the "revolutionary subduers" crushed to death by the stampeding crowd.

People were running in all directions, frenziedly shouting: "They are shooting, they are shooting!"

A vast crowd of workers, numbering many thousands, rallied near one of the churches ... The rumbling of a distant cannon shot ... The church dome crumbled with a crash ... Another shell burst somewhere in the neighbourhood. That was followed by more and more. The throng was seized with frenzy. It scattered like a panic-stricken pack of animals. The outpost still continued bombarding. The aiming was constantly corrected and the bursting shells took their toll among the scattering crowds.

The city became depopulated and strangely silent. The people went into hiding; some managed to escape.

No less than two thousand victims were snatched from the ranks of the workers.

Thus ended the first part of the Astrakhan tragedy. (13:101-3)

What demands had their meeting made to possibly justify this reaction? Had they, for example, called for a victory for the White Guards or aided them? Had they hurled abuse or projectiles at the communists? No. They had made a request.

They wanted to go fishing and to be able to buy bread, both without hindrance. They did not even want this permanently but merely "until the difficulties of the food situation were regulated".

What they wanted was to be human. Humans stop hunger by doing something about it - searching for food - fishing. Machines stop without fuel and remain stationary, unresentful. Machines obey directives without any problem or disagreement, no matter how impossible a directive is to fulfill. Humans disobey, question, have emotions and refuse to be limited to the role of producer - a role communists love to see others in, perhaps because they love the products and hate people?

Trotsky's behaviour in the second half of the Astrakhan massacre only makes sense if either this is true or if he was paranoic, a view for which no evidence is obvious. In Terrorism and Communism, written nearly a year later, he shows quite clearly that productivity itself is what he loves, what he wants, which although it is tied to humans, is more important:

The more our machine equipment is worn out, the more disordered our railways grow, the less hope there is for us of receiving machines to any significant extent from abroad in the near future, the greater is the importance acquired by the question of living labour-power. At first sight it would seem that there is plenty of it. But

> how are we to get at it? How are we to apply it? How are we productively to organize it? Even with the cleaning of snow drifts from the railway tracks, we were brought face to face with very big difficulties. It was absolutely impossible to meet those difficulties by means of buying labour-power on the market, with the present insignificant purchasing power of money, and in the most complete absence of manufactured products. (20:144)

Trotsky here is after productivity while destroying the producers in much the same way that a child will discard the wrappings which hold chocolate. And like children, Trotsky and Lenin destroy what does not satisfy. Those who disagree are cast into "the dustbin of history", to use Trotsky's phrase, which he had applied to his former Menshevik co-workers in October 1917, who were forcibly dispersed after being democratically elected to the soviets -"the dustbin" in this case being mass graves or the Volga River.

The Astrakhan workers were not being taught a lesson that would leave the survivors servile: they were being eradicated -and on Trotsky's orders. On March 12 Trotsky telegrammed a three word directive: "Give no quarter."

The same survivor recounts how Trotsk y's order was carried out -first to die were the prisoners already taken, to whom quarter had apparently been given:

> The second part, and the ghastlier, began on March 12...The Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council, L. Trotsky, was laconic in his cabled answer: "Give no quarter." And the fate of the unfortunate prisoners was sealed. The city was swept with a bloody frenzy.
>
> Shootings were going on in the cellars of the Che-Ka, and in many cases just simply in the back yards of the city's houses. Men were thrown overboard from steamers and barges. Some of those unfortunates were thrown into the river with stones tied on their necks or had their hands and feet tied... In one night 180 people were thrown into the Volga from the steamer "Gogol". And in the city itself, in the chambers of the Che-Ka, the number of executed people was so great that the burying facilities utterly broke down. It was hardly possible to bury the corpses; most of them were just piled up in heaps and put down as "Typhus-stricken". (13:103)

This creates a feeling of deja vu, of accounts of Nazi concentration camps: the massive numbers, the emphasis on efficiency, the depersonalization are all the same.

The next paragraph could be a description of the methods of such modern Stalinist groups as some of the Lebanese war groups or Pol Pot's terrorists in the late 1970's:

> The commandant extraordinary, F. Chugunov, issued an order forbidding, under the threat of shooting, to drop off corpses on the way to the cemetery. Almost every morning the people of Astrakhan would find in the streets semi-nude, blood-stained bodies of shot workers. And early at dawn people could be seen wandering among those corpses in search of their dear ones. (13:103)

Then the Bolsheviks finally turned on the middle class. By early April the death toll from this incident numbered over four thousand, and showed no signs of abating.

After the Astrakhan massacre came the break up of the unions, soviets and industrial co-operatives in central Russia. Non-Bolshevik members were shot or sentenced to a de facto execution by imprisonment in typhus-infested jails.

In Kiev, when the soviets had a non-Bolshevik majority, their conference was forcibly dissolved. In Moscow where the same thing happened, the veteran Bolshevik, Sosnovsky, who supported workers' democracy, was forcibly stopped from speaking. A decade later he would be making the same demands against Stalin- and would suffer the same fate as the Astrakhan workers of 1919. (13:103-142)

The Chemical Workers Union and the co-operative movement were not only destroyed by the killing or imprisoning of known "disagreers" but by absorption and merging with safely Bolshevized state organizations and unions. (22:586-7).

These tactics also tied in with trials of supposed saboteurs in the factories. The published punishment and verdict of one such archetypal trial, that of the Government of Simbrisk, in its case against twelve workers, is strikingly reminiscent or what would be derogatively called Stalinist in later years. Yet here in a document of July 27, 1920, under Trotsky's directives are all the hallmarks of Stalinism The bizarre allegations, the attempts to break down the individuals, the merciless cruelty, the glorification of the police state, the casual tone of naturalness in which the concept of the total self-sacrifice of the individual for the state is couched, could have been written by Stalin or Vyshinsky. The concept of crime and punishment is also archetypal of Stalinism: one defendant, for example, got three years of unparoled forced labour for making jokes about the communists and about work, and for speculation, i.e. selling or trading anything.

Stalin at this time was involved in setting up unequal pay systems, networks of rewarded informers in the Ukrainian unions, brainwashing, and enforced labour conscription, which included reinforcing the old concept of women as kitchenworkers.

All this was done on Lenin's unambiguous, brutally blunt orders contained within his letter to Stalin of January 24, 1920. This document is

not hidden away in some obscure work, nor does it come from sources hostile to Lenin. It is in his Collected Letters, yet no Marxist historian has to my knowledge discussed this important document. It ties Lenin, Stalin and Stalin's chief, Trotsky, together in the intentional establishment of a police state knowingly based on fascistic exploitation. To give one example:

> To make this participation varied according to the stage of development of the participators, beginning with the role of "eavesdropper", or witness, or a hired informant or a learner, for those workers and peasants, who are illiterate and undeveloped, and ending with full privileges (or almost all) for the literate, educated and those who in one way or another have been tested.

Both the Simbrisk Tribunal's verdict and Lenin's letter of January 24, 1920 deserve to be reproduced in full but as they are more relevant to the militarization of labour and also to the question of "did Stalinism come from Leninism", they will be reproduced and analyzed at greater length in those chapters.

Stalin had been ordered to act as Trotsky's lieutenant in the takeover of the Ukrainian soviets by Lenin, but most of the work had already been carried out by Trotsky and other lieutenants. The destruction of the Ukrainian soviets began on April 10, 1919 when Dybenko, who had himself been a Bolshevik dissident, "dissolved by my order" the soviet congress which if its members disobeyed "... shall be considered manifestly counter-revolutionary and its organizers will expose themselves to the severest repressive measures ..." (1:122-3)

One Bolshevik could declare a conference representing two million people counter-revolutionary and claim to represent the toiling masses! It was a farce, turned very bitter by Trotsky's takeover from Dybenko, while Dybenko's arrogance and ignorance (he misunderstood the title of the conference and its purpose) are buffoonish, Trotsky's arrogance had a cold merciless logic:

ORDER NO. 1824
OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MILITARY COUNCIL
OF THE REPUBLIC.
KHAR'KOV, JUNE 4, 1919.

To all Military Commissars and to all Executive Committees of the districts of Aleksandrovsk, Mariupol', Berdyansk, Bakhmut, Pavlograd and Kherson.

The Executive Committee of Gulyai-Polye, with the collaboration of the staff of Makhno's brigade, is trying to call, for the 15th of this month, a congress of soviets and insurgents of the districts of Aleksandrovsk, Mariupol', Berdyansk, Melitopol', Bakhmut and Pavlograd. This congress is squarely directed against the Soviet Power in the Ukraine and against the organization of the southern

front, where Makhno's brigade is stationed. This congress can have no other result than to excite some new disgraceful revolt like that of Grigor'ev, and to open the front to the Whites, before whom Makhno's brigade can only retreat incessantly, on account of the incompetence, criminal designs and treason of its commanders.

1. By the present order this congress is forbidden, and will in no case be allowed to take place.

2. All the peasants and working class population shall be warned, orally and in writing, that participation in the said congress shall be considered an act of high treason against the Soviet Republic and the Soviet front.

3. All delegates to the said congress shall be arrested immediately and brought before the Revolutionary Military Tribunal of the 14th, formerly 2nd, Army of the Ukraine.

4. The persons spreading the call of Makhno and the Gulyai-Polye Executive Committee shall likewise be arrested.

5. The present order shall have the force of law as soon as it is telegraphed. It should be widely distributed,displayed in all public places, and sent to the representatives of the executive committees of towns and villages, as well as to all the representatives of Soviet authority, and to commanders and commissars of military units.

Trotsky,President of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic;
Vatsetis, Commander in Chief;
Aralov, Member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic;
Koshkarev, Military Commissar of the Khar'kov region. (1:120-1)

This raises several points about soviet democracy. In the following notice of the same conference, it will be noted that the structure allows for delegates from the Bolsheviks in three separate ways: from the general populace, from the peasants, and workers from executive committees, and even if they had no representatives in these sections, the "Red Army" and "districtv party organizations" are Bolshevik groups.

Also the agenda, with its hostility to the white guards, its emphasis on grass-roots democracy, and its keen defence of soviets, make nonsense of most of Trotsky's allegations. It should also be pointed out that the extremly wide invitation is in strong contrast to the Bolshevik form of decision making at this time: secret telegrams, conversations and letters within the hierarchy, and intrigues behind closed doors:

CONVOCATION OF THE FOURTH
Extra EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESS OF WORKERS'
PEASANTS AND INSURGENTS' DELEGATES.

Telegram No. 416.

To all the Executive Committees of the districts, towns and villages of the governments of Ekaterinoslav, Tauride and neighbouring regions; to all the units of the First Insurrectionary Division known as Batko Makhno's; to all the troops of the Red Army located in the same region. To all! To all!

In its session of May 30, the Executive Committee of the Revolutionary Military Council, after having examined the situation at the front, created by the offensive of the White bands, and also the situation in general- political and economic - of the Soviet power, reached the conclusion that only the working masses themselves could find a solution, and not individuals or parties. That is why the Executive Committee of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Gulyai-Polye region has decided to call an extraordinary congress for June 15, 1919, at Gylyai- Polye. Method of Election: 1)The peasants and workers will send a delegate for each three thoudand inhabitants. 2)The insurgents and Red soldiers will delegate a representative from each unit(regiment, division, etc.). 3)The staffs:Batko Makhno' division, two delegates; the brigades, one delegate from each brigade staff. 4) The executive committees of the districts will send one delegate from each faction. 5) The district party organizations which adhere to the program of the Soviet regime will send one delegate from each organization.

Remarks: a) the elections of delegates of peasants and workers will take place at general assemblies of villages, towns, factorie and workshops;b) separate meetings of members of soviets ar factory committees will not take place; c) since the Revolutionar Military Council does not have the necessary means, the delegates should come provided with food and money.

Agenda: a) Report of the Executive Committee of the Revolutionary Military Council and reports of the delegates; b) the current situation; c) the role, tasks and aims of the Soviet of Peasants', Workers', Insurgents', and Red Soldiers' Delegates of the Gulyai-Polye Region; d) reorganization of the Revolutionary Military Council of the region; e) organization of military activity in the region; f) the problem of food supply; g) the agrarian problem h) financial questions; i) public security; k) exercise of justice in the region; l) current matters.

Executive Committee of the Revolutionary Military Council.

Gulyai-Polye, May 31, 1919 (1:112-3)

A few other slanders contained in order 1824 should be discussed. Makhno publicly denounced Gregorief's pro-White Guard mutiny in a proclamation which was co-signed by both his military staff and four leading Bolsheviks of the "Aleksandrovsk Executive Committee of the Council of Deputies of Workers, Peasants and Red Guards". They joined the Makhnovites in placing much blame on Cheka harshness and Bolshevik intrigues for opening the front. (1:114-7). This proclamation was prined before order 1824. A few days after order 1824 appeared, Makhno and one of his staff killed Gregoriev and his leading henchman in a gun battle.

Gregorief, who had requested a congress, was shot because he suggested an alliance with the whites against the Bolsheviks, and refused to answer for a pogrom he had organized in Elisavetegrad a month before. Although many of Gregoriev's followers were later expelled for anti-semitism, banditry and irresponsibility, Makhno at that point turned the congress into a unification of the two armies to fight the advancing whites. The great revolutionary, Trotsky, on the other hand, was busy at this time crushing the "Rosa Luxemburg Soviet Collective" with the aid of secret police and former Czarist officers. Voline and Arshinov both describe the executions of members of the Makhno cultural section, soviet delegates and supporters, and also of peasants who had merely talked about the proposed conference. (1:124-5) (22:589-9).

Did Makhno open the front to the whites? The anarchist eyewitnesses Voline and Arshinov, and also Rudolf Rocker, later a visitor to northern Russia, blamed the lack of weapons and ammunition, which was no longer supplied by the bolsheviks after the spring of 1919. (1:118) (16:28) (22:599).

There is evidence to suggest that Trotsky's crushing of the Makhnovites and other autonomous soviet peasant worker groups was based on envy of their previous military successes. In talking of incorporating them into the Red Army, he writes in another secret document of May 1,1919:

> The psychological difficulty of the change of course lies in the fact that units which, to their own way of thinking, are crowned with a halo of brilliant victories and conquests of towns and gubernias, have to be broken and taken in hand with a grasp of iron. (21:391).

Marxists have suggested that Makhno and others like him should have let themselves be absorbed into the Red Army to avoid problems. This same document describes Trotsky's new methods to be used after General Antonov, a Red partisan and admirer of the peasant rebels, is replaced with the Czarist officer, Vatzetis:

> In practical terms the task amounts, above all, to purging commissar personnel. Commissars who have been lulled to sleep by victories must be removed and replaced by new Party workers of a critical turn of mind: failing this, no further work will

> make any headway. Swollen detachments must be relieved of their parasitical and marauder elements, and there must be no stopping short at the most savage measures -shooting, drafting to the units of the rear levies, imprisonment in the concentration camps; simultaneously a decisive struggle against "meetingprone" commanders; resolute measures applied to one or two cases will immediately compel the rest to pull themselves together.(21:393).

("meetingprone") here refers to the last vestige of soviet democracy in the Red Army -a procedure where grievances, problems, constructive ideas, and elections developed.)

Not only are the forms of discipline to become Red fascist, but even the way the army is formed is to stop being an expression of spontaneous workers' self-organization,, and is to become the reserve of Trotsky, where thousands will blindly follow his fixed plan after being brainwashed, then given gradually worse punishments:

> All this work must be carried out on the basis of a fixed plan for organizing formations in place of the present arbitrary springing up of gregiments and divisions. Reserve units attached to divisions can ing up of gregiments and divisions. Reserve units attached to divisions can play a salutary role. If a reserve battalion is set up anew for each infected division and provided with a good commissar and disciplined cadres, the division can then be reformed and cur and cured within a short space of time, by filtering it through the reserve battalion. the reserve battalion.
>
> and
>
> If at the present moment it is resolute measures that are needed, after a certain time the need will be for drastic measures and then, in the event of further neglect, for measures of ruthless severity (21:393).

Who would voluntarily give up their freedom for this? No one, the Marxists reply, which is why Trotsky had to enforce them so the revolution could triumph.

In actuality, Trotsky's methods here did not have anything to do with military success, let alone preserving a real socialist revolution, as the Ukrainian campaign shows.

The Denekin advance began in early January 1919 from the white lines just north of Rostov-Movcherkask. By late May, before Trotsky's attack on the peasants, Denekin and Wrangel had reached the outskirts of Tsaritsyn and Gulai-Polye: advances of three hundred miles in nearly six months. Between mid-June and early October they advanced well over four hundred miles in less than four months - despite longer supply and communication lines and the increasing need to forage for food and to garrison many more captured towns.

The whites were aided by eighty thousand allied soldiers and whole batteries of artillery and squadrons of aircraft. Many of their men, such as most officers and the cossack cavalry were the elite of the old czarist army. (4:209-289) (10:156-160;209-225) (11) These facts would account for their early successful advance, but the increased speed of their offensive after mid-June must be blamed on Trotsky's acts.

It was a defeat of catastrophic proportions. After June 1919, an area the size of France populated by 42 million people, and containing Kiev, Russia's third largest city, and other major cities such as Khar'kov, Kherson, Kursk, Oriel, and Ekaritorinoslav fell to the whites. The Donets Basin, a highly industrialized area containing most of western Russia's coal supplies, was taken and its factories and coal mines were wrecked, crippling soviet industry for nearly a decade after. The Ukrainian granaries were also captured and devastated and farms were plundered and destroyed. The Ukraine was Russia's breadbasket and so famine worsened drastically. In military terms the disaster was also on a massive scale. According to Robert Jackson in his history At War with the Bolsheviks, nearly a quarter of a million prisoners were taen that summer. This is more prisoners lost than by either side in the four-year long American Civil War - and this figure excludes deaths, desertions and the number of wounded in the Red Army. Apart from battle deaths, there was the execution of Bolshevik civilians and soldiers and the pogroms, usually described as the most savage the world had known until the Nazi holocaust. While the exact numbers are not known and many victims were not killed by the whites, at least thirty-five thousand Jews died in Denekin's advance. The same source acknowledges over a hundred thousand fatalities was more likely; another source claims possibly a million casualties. (See Bruno Kenez, Civil Was in South Russia 1919-1920. "Pogroms", pp.166-177) The Ukrainian and southern Russian non-Jewish populations were also devastated by endless killings and plunderings. Although no reliable figures exist, the casualties must have been at least several hundred thousand.

The Red Army now consisted of a bedraggled core of survivors and well-equipped crack troops rushed in from other fronts. In troops, machine guns and ammunition they were numerically superior to Denekin's forces, but he still had more planes, tanks and artillery.

Trotsky's Red Army of 186,000 men retreated before a force of, at its peak, 150,000 men.

The only Red Army forces which had anything to do with halting Denekin's advance were the partisans and Budenny's cavalry - both these sections were bitterly opposed to Trotsky's dictatorial tactics.

This was the catastrophic defeat caused by Trotsky's policies, but he was not greatly worried. As I have mentioned in an earlier chapter, he preferred Denekin dominating the Ukraine to Makhno's alliance. (See Chapter 111, footnote 43, Red and Black, Issue 13, Winter 1984. This fact is also

accepted by Michael Mallet, Michael Palij, Arshinov, Voline, Alexander Berkman, Paul Avrich and others outside the Marxist ranks of historians.)

This ultra-sectarianism came from a man who, a decade later, was to attack Stalin's policy of "not worrying about the rightists, attack the other leftists" Trotsky would then correctrly attack Stalin as a stupid sectarian who opened the way for the victories of Chang Kai Shek, Franco and Hitler, by his policy of viewing other leftists as the main danger. Like Stalin a generation later, Trotsky dreamed of conquering India while counter-revolutionary armies swarmed toward Moscow.

Lenin and the Bolshevik central committee were less cavalier about the Ukrainian catastrophe and with good reason -only a country the size of Russia could survive a defeat of this magnitude. Even some of the worst disasters of the World Wars -Dunkirk, Verdun, the Somme, Tannenburg, Pearl Harbor, and Callipoli -were less disastrous in their casualty rates, demoralization and territory lost.

The Red Army, except for those units which mutinied and joined Makhno, and the local Red insurgents who had been fighting there since early 1918, fled north - and Trotsky led the flight. As at Koulgas in November 1918, he fled a battlefield when disater threatened. His military reputation is not only based on his great victories such as Kazan and Petrograd, but on his clever avoidance of defeats.

He left behind his second in command, Vatzetis, an ex-Czarist general, now in charge of the southern front, and Vatzetis took the blame from Lenin and the Bolshevik military command. Soon after he was framed:

COUNCIL
OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS OF THE R.S.F.S.R.
Kremlin, Moscow. Copy Top Secret, Telegram Cypher throughout
8 VII 1919.

To Trotsky.
Domozirov, who has been fully exposed as a traitor and has confessed, supplied factual testimony of a plot in which an active part was taken by Isaev, who has for a long time since been attached for duties to the C-inC(Vatzetis), with whom he lived in the same flat; and supplied a lot of other evidence and details that expose the C-in-C as having known of this plot. The C-in- C hasd had to be placed under arrest.
Dzerzinsky, Krestinsky, Lenin, Skljanskij.

True Copy from the archives of Comrade Skljanskij
(In Comrade Lenin's handwriting) (21:595).

Vatzetis was apparently involved in a trumped-up case, similar to that which Trotsky used to get Admiral Schtasny executed. Trotsky apparently requested that Vatzetis be released, and unlike most "white guard agents", he was released. This case is interesting in that Deutscher, in referring to the above dicument, states:"It originated with Stalin" (6:437). If this is

so ,it is an important piece of evidence linking Lenin and Stalin in what would become in the 1930 s a classic Stalinist tactic- the persecution of loyal supporters of Bolshevism on trumped up charges of being white guard agents. There had been other cases before mid 1919, but Marxist- Leninist historians could claim these were carried out without Lenin's knowledge or at least his consent. Here is a document in his own handwriting which combines an absolute tone of certainty with allegation which meant the death sentence. Dropping the case could have only been done if the "facts" were lies. As Vatzetis returned to active command with a general's rank, this was a tacit admittance of their fabrication. Would Lenin have entrusted a whole Red Army to anyone with suspected white guard ties? In true Stalinist fashion,Skljanskij, a loyal co-framer, went into the victim's position soon after. He became a more successful scapegoat, but was apparently not shot. (Krestinsky, a third loyal co-framer, was also framed by Stalin, then tried and shot for later contact with white guards and imperialist agents,

During mid to late 1919, Lenin's communiques to the southern front are among the most bombastic, shrill and urgent in his career. Quite frequently he calls for "stricter discipline" and sometimes openly explains this phrase, calling for shootings to invigorate the war effort. He blames no-one but the Bolshevik leadership for this crisis, and also the failures of Trotsky's proteges at the Siberian and western fronts (21:545;553;659-662). Although Trotsky was rarely blamed personally, he offered his resignation which Lenin refused, but he got a blasting when, in the middle of this extreme crisis, he suggested galloping across the Hindu-Kush (those jagged barren mountain ranges twenty-five thoudand feet and more high in many places), then conquering the Indian sub-continent. Don't warry about the Ukraine, the refugees from that front will conquer Siberia:

> The best elements of the Ukrainian Party who have at present withdrawn from Soviet work "for reasons outside their control" must be sent there. If they lost the Ukraine, let them conquer Siberia for the Soviet Revolution. With the conquest of the Ural steppes or the vast areas beyond the Urals we shall have the opportunity of creating cavalry formations on a broad scale, for which Zlatoust will provide the necessary arms. We have not had sufficient cavalry up to the present. But if, as experience has shown, cavalry is of enormous importance in a civil war of manoeuvre. its role in Asian operations would appear indisputably decisive. One authoritative military official already some months ago put up a plan for creating a cavalry corps (30,000-40,000 riders) with the idea of launching it against India.
>
> It stands to reason that a plan of this sort requires careful preparation, both material and political. We have up to now devoted too little attention to agitation in Asia. However, the international situation is evidently shaping in such a way that the road to Paris and London lies via the towns of Afghanistan, the Punjab and Bengal (21:625).

Lenin moved in on Trotsky's departments and virtually restructured Trotsky's command in response, and told him to wake up to the crisis::

> To Kiev-Rakovsky, Trotsky, Kassior.
> I emphatically recommend that all Commissariats be closed down save those for military affairs, transport communications, and supplies. Mobilise everyone to a man for military work and set them the task of hanging on if only for a few weeks, after merging the Council of People's Commissars, the Council of Defence, the Central Executive Committee and the C.C. of the Ukrainian C.P. into a single body. We request Trotsky to tighten things up for this purpose with all the vigour at his command.
> (Seal affixed) Politburo:Lenin, Kamenev,Stasova (21:659).

Although he was the main cause of this disaster, Trotsky had nothing to do with turning Denekin's offensive back.

I now wish to deal with a great achievement of the working and peasant classes which was nearly defeated by Trotsky, and then concealed by Trotsky himself - and possibly accidentally by some of his later literary admirers.

In the later 1920s Trotsky's achievements were also accredited to others, and concealed by Stalin, but Trotsky himself started this pattern in relation to the way the Makhno movement saved soviet Russia in late 1919. Like Stalin, Trotsky's part in causing disaster is concealed, both by himself and by his literary followers, and he is praised for another's deeds.

After his attack on the Makhno movement opened the Ukraine to the whites, they rapidly seized much of the Ukraine, Russia's most fertile area, and then advanced into Central Russia, aiming to capture Moscow. In Deutscher's words, Deneking got as close to the Kremlin as "Tula, the last importan town before Moscow". With Isaac Deutscher, Trotsky's failure to save Moscow is covered not only by this same tactic, but by putting the supposed cause for Denekin's failure in the footnotes. At first glance, the reasons given seem very creditable. Denekin and Wrangel are quoted, and they seem to blame the demoralization of the army on local hostility and endless pillaging. (6:44;445 -footnote 3). In fact, both generals blamed Makhno as the main cause, as Michael Palij's recent work,The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno makes clear. Palij quotes primary source material from both generals which is unambiguous. (14:194). Another recent historian, Bruno Knez, describes Makhno's campaign against Denekin as being of enormous consequences and "an immense contribution". "Denekin's army collapsed largely thanks to Makhno's achievement." Knez bases his viewpoint on the eyewitness account of a British General, J. Hodgson. His testimony was available in 1932. (see Bruno Kenez,Civil War in South Russia 1919 -1920, and Michael Palij, The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno, Universtity of Seattle Press, 1977).

While Hodgson's work is now not easily accessible, and Dimitry Lehovich's testimony came after Deutscher's death, this still leaves, as I will show, eleven eyewitness or contemporary accounts which back this fact in easily accessible works- which were in print years before The Prophet Armed was published. Furthermore, Trotsky, and more particularly, Deutscher, by their own admissions, knew of several of these accounts.

For example, in The White Army, printed in 1930, Denekin makes this point about Makhno again. After making the points Deutscher lists, he describes Makhno's campaign behind his lines mentioning how:

> To deal with them we were obliged to withdraw from the Volunteer and Don Army fronts one and a half cavalry divisions, and from the Petliura front a corps under General Slastchev. For a whole month our troops dealt Makhno's bands one blow after another.

and then there was the effect:

> This revolt had the effect of disorganizing our rear and weakening the front at the most critical period of its existence (5:325-7).

If Deutscher uses Wrangel and Denekin's sources, why is this crucial information left out?

Voline and Arshinov, both eyewitnesses with the Makhno movement, stated the same thing, as did two foreign journalists stationed in the Ukraine who worked independently, the pro-socialist Pierre Berland and C.E.Bechhofer, and another white guard, General Slaschchov, as well as a Bolshevik eyewitness, Simonov.(1:146-8) (3:171;175) (14:184;203; 308) (22:624-6)

And these nine separate eyewitnesses were substantiated by other contemporaries in Northern Russia, Rudolf Rocker also stated the same thing, and Emma Goldman, who arrived in Russia in early 1920, quoted a dissident who publicly stated this fact in a Petrograd meeting. In her 1923 work My Disillusionment in Russia, she also recounted this fact and many others, supplied by Ukrainian refugees, and mentions that Makhno was praised as a military genius by soviet mewspapers for this exploit (8:734) (9:64) (16:35). Trotsky's friend and later fellow anti-Stalinist, Victor Serge, in his Memoirs of A Revolutionary, mentions how: "In September 1919, at Uman he (Makhno) inflicted a defeat on General Denekin from which the latter was never to recover."(17:121).

Deutscher uses Serge as a major source, yet does not use this information. He also lists Arshinov in his bibliography, but also ignores this, just as Wrangel's and Denekin's quite clear testimony on Makhno is not used. Despite being highly regarded primary source accounts, the works of Voline and Goldman are never mentioned, although both have sections on Trotsky, and Voline was a friend and co-worker of Trotsky's between 1905 and 1917.

And these are only the primary sources. In Deutscher's life-time, Makhno's saving of Moscow (and hence probably soviet Russia) was referred to by the following eminent historians, in the following well-known works:

W.H. Chamberlin, The Russian Revolution 1935, Volume2, Chapter 35,1935.
Max Nomad, "Nestor Makhno, the Bandit Who Saved Moscow" in Apostles of Revolution 1939, p.302.
Paul Avrich, The Russian Anarchists 1967, Chapter 8 'The Downfall of Anarchism'.

This represents a total of eight contemporary writers accepting a fact, and a total of none who tried to disprove it. Since Deutscher's death, another eyewitness account By Dimitry Lehovich confirms this from the viewpoint of Denekin and Wrangel. Other important recent Historians, apart from Palij and Knez, who mention the real reasons for Denekin's success, and Makhno's crucial role, include Frank Sysyn, Michael Mallet and Richard Luckett.

I have dwelt on this point for a very good reason. It shows that to uphold communism, not only people but facts must be "thrown into the dustbin of history". The facts show that the revolution was put into mortal danger and not saved by the Red Terror and Lenin's theory of a one-party police state, but saved by an army which practised collective decision making, tolerated political differences within its ranks, and was not led by a vanguard party or inspired by Marxist theory.

When this is considered, the whole Marxist justification for their police state repressions begins to totter. In the 1919 Ukraine campaign, Trotsky showed how Bolshevik methods can lead to failure, and Makhno showed how freer, more humane policies can be successful.

In dealing with this, only two primary sources I have found fail to mention Makhno's role. One of these is a memoir by an English officer who, due to inexperience, describes only what he sees or has been told by white guard supporters (see H.N.H. Williamson. Farewell to the Don 1971).

The other is Leon Trotsky -the source all best-selling Marxists use. In his autobiography, My Life, the Makhnovites are invisible and there is very little mention of them elsewhere in his writings -and most of that tiny amount was after awkward questions were raised in the 1930s.

For Trotsky, Denekin just "advances from the south" -the front opens for no reason (18). He covers one of the most massive defeats ever suffered by a military commander by devoting a whole chapter of his autobiography to his saving victory at Moscow -a someone else with whom he must share glory for himself. In referring to the celebrations over his Petrograd victory, he describes them as being all the greater because "we (sic) had just begun to win decisive successes on the southern front as well(18)."

Trotsky then goes on to belittle Stalin for wanting credit for battles he did not win! With pseudo-modesty and coyness, Trotsky describes his own courage in battle, and how his servant, aghast at his courage goes into battle himself:

> ...racing at my (Trotsky's) heels: He was beside himself with excitement. Brandishing a revolver he ran wildly along the line, repeating my appeals and yelling for all he was worth: "Courage boys. Comrade Trotsky is leading you." The men were now advancing at the pace at which they had been retreating before. Not one of them remained behind (18).

In the same style there is a coy passage where Lenin awards Trotsky the order of the red banner - an award Trotsky designed himself.

His "definitive biographer" Isaac Deutscher, follows Trotsky's literary pattern in The Prophet Armed (The errors in Deutscher's account of this event are typical of his entire Trotsky legend, and I will bring more errors up in relevant sections). Trotsky's failure to save Moscow is dealt with in more detail, but his role in the causes for this disaster are covered in the

same way. The Makhno movement appears as nothing more than a cavalry gang led by "Atman Makhno" (a Cossack title for war chief, a title never given to, nor taken by Makhno), andTrotsky's extermination of four hundred thousand people by machine gunning, slave labour and imprisonment in concentration camps is covered with: "In the end, Budenny's cavalry dispersed and destroyed Makhno's detachments."

Technically this is true, but it is a clever truth. There is something very pathetic about the reality. Makhno was a man of faults equal to his virtues: bossy, violent, and at times apparently vandalistic. But as the savior of the revolution, he deserved better than to be carried across the Romanian border with Bolshevik bullet wounds in his neck, face and stomack. About two hundred other refugees were with him, being chased by Budenny's cavalry, but what of the other four hundred thousand?

Arshinov is credited as one of two sources for this information. Actually Arshinov is one of the major sources for the real methods I have just described. (See The Prophet Armed p.416, footnote).

The Trotsky version was given credibility by Deutscher and made a well established fact by the endless stream of pro-Trotsky articles and books printed by the many Trotskyist groups. Even among those readers who only deal in best-sellers, these ideas are perpetuated. In 1973 a sincere but misinformed account, Wyndham and King's biography, appeared with an account of the Ukrainian campaign obviously based on Deutscher's. Once more the Makhnovites are euphemistically "dispersed", once more Trotsky had no responsibility for opening the Ukrainian front. Yet their work is better than Ronald Segal's the Tragedy of Leon Trotsky, where admiration is taken to the extent of totally accepting Trotsky's statements on this matter. There is no evidence of any non-Bolshevik source material being considered. The Makhnovites do not exist again.

Yet these three accounts are the ones found selling in the bookshops. Knez and]alij are in some reference sections of the bigger libraries. How people love heroes -and ignore the truth.

(In the next issue of Red and Black I will deal with further examples of Bolshevik suppression of the working class in relation to the militarization of labour and the Kronstadt Rebellion).

Notes

1. Arshinov, P. History of the Makhno Movement; 1917-1921.
2. Avrich, P. The anarchists in theRussian Revolution.
3. Bechhofer,C.E. In Denekin's Russia and the Caucasus: 1919-1920.
4. Chamberlin, W.:H. The Russian Revolution. Vol.2.
5. Denikin, A.(sic) The White Army (1930 rpt) Florida; Academic International Press, 1973.
6. Deutscher, I. The prophet armed.
7. Getzler, I. Kronstadt 1917-1921. Cabridge; Cambridge University Press, 1983.

8. Goldman, E. Living mylife.
9. Goldman, E. My disillusionment in Russia.
10. Jackson, R. At war with the Bolsheviks. (1972 rpt) London; Tandem Books, 1974.
11 Kenez, B. Civil war in Russia: 1919-1920.
12. Lenin, V. The State and Revolution. (1917 rpt) New York; International Publishers, 1974.
13. Maximov, G.P. The guillotine at work.
14, Palij, M. The anarchism of Nestor Makhno. Seattle; University of Seattle Press, 1977.
15. Raskalnikov, F. Kronstadt and Petrograd in 1917. (1925 rpt) London, New Park Publications, 1978.
16. Rocker, R. "The failure of state communism" Red and Black (12), 1984; p.28-39.
17. Serge, V. Memoirs of a revolutionary.
18 Trotsky, L. Myu life. Chaps. 34 and 35.
19. Trotsky, L. The Russian Revolution. Vol.III (1929 rpt). London@ V. Colancz 1933.
20. Trotsky, L. Terrorism and communism.
21 The Trotsky Papers.
22. Voline, The Unknown revolution: 1917 -1921. Michigan; Black and Red, 1974.

(to be continued)

THE DISCIPLINARY DOVE

Every good myth is a life-giving force, and this quality of life - enhancement is particularly up-fron t with the Christian myth of the Annunciation.

To say that the Annunciation is part of Christia mythology is no way to disparage it. It is simply to draw it into an understandable context.

Right at the beginning of that sequence of events of which Easter is the culmination, a rather startling fact appears in this Christian mythology.

A close look at this sequence can throw a great deal of both psychological and cultural light on the main tendencies and pruposes of the Christian myth.

The beginning of the sequence is, of course, the Annunciation, or Conception of Jesus.

Here, one of the normal figures of "Conception" is no longer present. The natural trinity of Father, Mother, and Son is significantly altered.

It tells us at once that there is some conflict present in the attitude towards the Parents, and in particular, towards the Father.

The conception of Jesus occupies in a most unusual manner. The Father does not appear at all and the impregnation itself is effected by the archangel's word of greeting and (tradition tells us) by the simultaneous breath of a Dove entering the ear of the Virgin.

The Dove itself, which is understood to represent the Holy Ghost, emanates from the Father's mouth.

St. Zeno tells us:"The womb of Mary swells forth by the Word, not by seed"; and St. Elevtherios (to select one only from numerous examples) exclaims: "O blessed Virgin...made mother without co-operation of man. For here the ear was the wife, and the angèlic word the husband."

The idea of breath being invested, in the archaic mind, with seminal connotation is familiar to us from many other religious traditions---the Orphic and Stoic concept of the pneuma or creative breath, for example, or the Vedic idea of the fertilizing element in prana.

The descent of a god in the form of a dove is not unknown from other religious traditions, either. Zeus, for one, descended upon Phtheia in just this form, and as a swan upon Leda.

It's clear, too, that the Greeks imputed much the same meaning to the event as Christians do to the Annunciation. In fact, the poet W.B. Yeats used the correspondence rather closely in his work. His two plays Calvary and The Resurrection hinge on it, and he made the mystical and psychological ideas that were synmbolized by the two bird-annunciations explicit in his explanatory text Dove or Swan which eventually came to form part of the mysteriuous cosmic system outlined in A Vision.

The provocative opening lines of Calvary identify a kind of person whose psychology, symbolized by the bird-form of a white heron, cannot be directly touched... or 'saved'... by the Easter myth as it now stands. They read as follows:

> Motionless under the moon-beam,
> Up to his feathers in the stream;
> Although fish leap, the white heron
> Shivers in a dumbfounded dream.
> God has not died for the white heron.

The white heron, of course, is identical in mythology with the ibis, that Egyptian bird who affords us some interesting correlatives to the Christian verson of a divine birth, and a divine trinity. If I now pass from the Egyptian ibis to the Egyptian crocodile, I do not do so irrespinsibly, but because, in this psychological complex of ideas, certain Egyptian beliefs about the crocodile have direct bearing on mytheme, for the crocodile was taken by early Christians to be a symbol for both the Logos and the Holy

Gghost. Moreover, the creature was believed to impregnate its mate, just as the Virgin was said to be, thru the ear.

Now, on the one hand the crocodile was notable to the ancients for having no external genital organs, no tongue, and no voice. Thus on one level it had symbolic indications of impotencey. Yet, on the other hand...in spite of these negative and dificient qualities, or more to the point, exactly because of them... it was regarded as of exceptional sexual virility, and a number of aphrodisiac customs were based on this belief.

Thus the ancients seemed to have reached the conclusion that the most potent agent of all was one who could fertilize even without the physical means of doing so: and just as, in this virile gradation, speech was more potent than sperm, silence was even more potent still... and we know in tthat version of early Christianity known as Gnosticism, that Sige, or Silence, was the first of the creative emanations, or Aions, to proceed from the Father.

In other words, the excessive potency of the Father is being here symbolically expressed by the image of fertilization by the breath of the Dove.

However, in individual psychology, we know that an over-emphasis on Paternal Potency is not a primary phenomenon, but that it is a transference frompersonal narcissism in response to the fear of castration as a punishment for incestuous wishes towards the Mother.

Thus, a belief such as this, of impregnation by breath, represents a reaction to an unusually intense castration paranoia, and it can occur only when the attitude towrds the Father is particularly ambivalent, a hostile denial of Paternal Potency alternating with affirmation of and subjection to Father's supreme might.

Both of these attitudes are indicated in the Christian myth. The idea of impregnation at a distance and by the mere breath of the Dove reveal a Phantasy of tremendous potency, one to which the Son is, thru-out, subjected.

At the same time, the Dove, the undoubtedly a Phallic symbol...every love goddess of the ancient world from Ishtar to Aphrodite does not seem able to function without it... still, as a phallic symbol, is also undeniably the most effeminate of Phallic symbols.

In short, the Father's might in this myth is manifested only at the expense of being associated with considrable effeminacy.

More, this androgynous Dove finally manages to entirely displace the Mother in the Christian Trinity. The transition from the Mother to the Holy Ghost, the replacement of the figure of the Mother by an androgynous 'third' person in the natural trinity of Father, Mother, and Son was not, of course, effected without a cultural struggle. Several sects tried to retain a Mother divinity along the lines of an Isis: indeed, it was not till the

Council of Nice that the Melchite heresy, which consisted exactly in this natural trinity instead of one consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was crushed.

So what culturally and psychologically, does this change of sex, and this substitution of the Mother by the Holy Ghost represent? First, psychologically, the imagined desirability of renouncing simultaneously incestuous wishes towards the Mother and parricidal wished towards the Father: more, the imagined desirability of replacing these parricidal wihes by a stronger attachment to the Father.

Culturally, it represents the imagined desirability of renouncing the Pleasure-Principle, of sublimating the natural impulses (associated firmly by the uncounscious with the oceanic at-one-ment of a child's life-at-the-breast) in the interests of culture, vocation, productivity and, in short, work.

Put in terms of the instincts, an incestuous heterosexual fixation is replaced by a sublimated homosexuality... and at the communal level, this sublimation and inversion manifests as the birth and maintenance of culture, with all its benefits and drawbacks.

Interestingly enough, it is exactly this transformation of the instincts which it is the purpose of every archaic puberty and initiatory rite to effect.

The complicated procedures witnessed in the initiatory rites of tribal life have just this essential aim: to establish the fiction that a boy has been annulled of his Physical birth and been re-born by the Father.

Consequently, we need not be surprised to learn that this, too, is tthe avowed aim of the Christian myth, nor to find the effeminate Dove appearing at exactly that point where, in the myth of Jesus, this rebirth as "Son of the Father" is effected...namely, at the baptism in the river Jordan.

Thus the work of the Christian myth consists in symbolically representing the path taken by culture, and recapitulated by each person as well as he and even she can, of giving up gratification of the Oedipal and Electral impulses. Object-love for the Mother is replaced by a reversion to the original identification with her, so that incest is avoided and the Father pacified; further, the opportunity is in this way given of winning theFather's love by the adoption of a feminine attitude towards him.:

What characterizes the Christian version of this Oedipal renunciation (as against other religious symbolizations of it) is the sharpness of the ambivalence towards the Father. It is the very sharpness of the hostile component of feeling towards theFather which has necessitated a still further refinement of repression, indicated by the substitution of an androgynous Dove for the Mother.

Culturally, this hostile component has manifested as a quite amazing productive drive and missionary zeal... so that what we call 'the work

ethic', thoug developed in its Protestant form very much later, lies encapsulated in the very structure of the myth, and by the same token so does the repression and sublimation of the instincrs.

This establishment of delayed (and in crtain cases abandonned) gratification is presented as a life-giving force. That is, we could say, perhaps a little flippantly but nonetheless accurately for all that, Jesus 'saves' by saving it and to become a disciple of his is to become a devotee of discipline.

Perhaps the poignancy of the myth lies just in that.

George Daniel

Pages of Socialist History

IX.

MARX VS. J. S. MILL, ADAM SMITH, AND OTHERS.

The germs of hate and disloyalty manifested on all occasions by the Marxists, are to be found, I have said, in the writings of the master. And truly, it would be difficult to single out, in the whole of European literature, another of the value of Marx so hateful and disloyal toward the Socialists of other schools, as well as toward independent thinkers.

His unliterary-like attacks against Proudhon are well enough known! His implacable hatred against Bakunin led him to acts scarcely commendable, for it was Marx's paper that launched the libel, repeated by Liebknecht and others, that Bakunin, chained down in the subterranean prisons of Olmutz in Austria, after the revolution of Dresden, was an agent and spy of the czar.* It was Marx, also, who drew up the pamphlet —of melancholy celebrity—"L'Alliance Internationale", that heap of lies and calumnies collected by a Russian Marxist, named Outine, who soon after implored the czar's pardon. In this pamphlet, which their shame has withheld from circulation, Bakunin was treated as a common swindler, and his friends of the Jurassian Federation as charlatans.

* Mazzini, Kossuth, and Herzen obliged him to retract this infamy. The Social Democratic reptiles, however, have not ceased repeating it

Certainly, it may be urged as an excuse that, in a polemic, ill-chosen accusations and epithets are sometimes cast. We grant that. Only, note well, the Social Democratic writers have made a veritable specialty of this mode of discussion. It might be added also that Proudhon was the first to emit the Anarchist idea, that Bakunin, James Guillaume, and the Jurassians propagated it in the International, and that against the Anarchists as against all those who attack the State, it is permissible for every Social Democrat to launch all sorts of accusations. But to what can be attributed the hateful attacks of Marx against the brilliant, profound, and ingenious Russian Revolutionary publicist, A. Herzen? Marx knew well that Herzen was the true initiator of the Socialist and Revolutionary movement in Russia. He knew that Herzen published at his own expense an entire Revolutionary library in the Russian language, that he maintained Proudhon's paper, and the political refugees of all nationalities. He knew also that Bakunin, treated by him and his disciples as a spy, had translated his "Communist Manifesto" into Russian, which Herzen published at his own expense in 1862; but, despite all that, he accused him of defending slavery, called him the rich *feuilletoniste* of the knout, and his most unjust and vulgar attacks were not published in an ephemeral, flying leaflet, but in his life work, in "Capital."

Perhaps his bitterness toward Herzen was owing to the latter's not having bequeathed his large fortune to the Socialist movement. In that case, Marx should have been still more severe toward his *alter ego*, F. Engels, who not only did not repudiate his personal fortune, but until 1869 retained his partnership in a Manchester manufactory, directly exploiting the workers, accumulating the "surplus value," the unearned increment. Marx was unable to treat Herzen, a revolutionist, and rich by birth, as an adversary, and heap unlimited praise on his intimate friend. Now, there had to be another motive. The origin of that hatred must be sought in the materialistic philosophy of Herzen; not in the Materialism of the petty bourgeoisie and shopkeepers, preached by Engels and the Social Democrats, but in that of Bacon and Locke, and of the Encyclopedists, as well as of the contemporary inductive sciences; in other words, in that Materialism which Engels treated as vulgar, and which denies every hypothesis of a God, challenges all priests, and rejects the Supernaturalism of Hegel, Marx, and Engels, etc.

Marx knew that it was Herzen that gave Hegelism its death blow in Russia before 1845; that Bakunin, and above all, the great Russian literary critic, Zielinsky, freed themselves from the reactionary metaphysics and

baneful dialectics, thanks to the influence of Herzen. The proof that it was really for his inductive and material philosophy that Marx attacked Herzen, can be found in his attacks on the brilliant professor of geology and zoology, Charles Vogt, the intimate friend of Herzen and Bakunin.

It may be said, it is true, that Marx and Engels did not spare Vogt, because, having been a revolutionary in 1848, he became later a moderate politician. But Vogt was not the only one who became moderate, or even reactionary. Among others, their friend and collaborator, the poet Freiligrath, became not only moderate, but sang the glory of Bismarck and William in 1870, without Marx occupying himself about him. It was not for his political moderation that he attacked him. The brilliant materialist professor treated God with as much seriousness as he did the German supernatural philosophy, so dear to Marx and his disciples.* Add to this that Vogt, friend of Herzen and Bakunin, again in 1849 dared to invoke Anarchy, and you have the true motives of the attacks of which he was the object.

It is chiefly the polemic between Marx and J. S. Mill which reveals to us in their fulness his literary methods.

Everybody is acquainted with the noble character, the broad humanitarian sympathies and ideas of the English philosopher. He was one of the most ardent champions of individual liberty, the rights of the minority, the emancipation of woman, the liberation of the working class, and the liberation of human thought from all metaphysics. His works, "System of Inductive Logic," "On Liberty," "On Positivism," on the "Philosophy of Hamilton," "On Woman," etc., etc., but chiefly the first two, are classed among the sublimest creations of the human mind. George Brand has devoted his best study to him. H. T. Buckle said that modern science would award the laurel wreath to the author of the "System of Inductive Logic."

Marx, dialectician, who "did the high metaphysician" in the Voltaire sense, detested the author of an inductive logic; he who, in 1848, preached "the organization of the army of labor, especially of agriculture," the State monopoly, the submission of the individual, could only make war *à outrance* against the author of "Liberty," against the champion of indi-

* M. H., like a good Marxist, ridicules the materialism of Vogt, of Büchner, and others. Probably M. H. knows nothing of "Man and His Place in Nature," the "Letters on Physiology," "Love," and other works by these authors; otherwise he would know well that the principles and ideas of Lamarck, Darwin, Helmholtz, etc., are therein developed with a literary talent much superior to that of Marx.

vidual liberty and the rights of the minority. Some justice must be rendered to Marx. He directs in "Capital" an artistic campaign against the English philosopher. He never tires of ridiculing him. Before all else, he treats Mills as a bourgeois economist, as a defender of the existing order, as an enemy of the proletariat. He serves his readers with quotations calculated to provoke indignation against Mill; but if they are verified after the original English text—who knows? might not one feel indignant against Marx himself? For example, in "Principles of Political Economy" (Vol. I., Book II., Chap. 1, §3, ed. 1865) we read in Mill:

"If a choice had to be made between Communism, with all its chances, and the present state of society, with all its sufferings and injustices; if the institution of private property imposed, as consequence, that the product of labor should be appropriated, as we see it today, in inverse ratio to work; when the greatest part is for those who never work, since those whose work is only nominal receive the greatest share, in such wise that by degrees the reward of labor becomes less as labor becomes more rude and disagreeable, so truly, so indeed, that the labor which is the most fatiguing, and therefore the most exhausting, does not assure with certainty the acquisition of the common necessaries of life; *if between that and Communism, a choice had to be made, all the difficulties, great and small, of Communism, would not weigh more than dust in the balance."*

As ordinarily all the great English philosopher's sympathies are with the exploited, not being a Communist, for he believed Communism to be the negation of individual liberty; nevertheless, he declared himself for Communism, provided that the misery of the present society would disappear. But how has Marx quoted the above passage? He has omitted its commencement and its conclusion; without the lines in italics, in such a manner that Mill as a bourgeois establishes the abomination of Capitalism, but finds nothing to say against it! * It is beautiful, this "scientific" honesty. Marx knew that such quotations are not allowed; for he, so precise in the indication of the pages and dates of all his quotations, often stupid and taken from a crowd of nobodies and unknown celebrities, he refers the reader on this occasion simply to the "Principles of Political Economy." Go, and seek the mutilated passage in two thick volumes! For many other quotations from the same Mill, Marx refers to no work whatever. I can imagine how faithful they must be.†

If he limited himself only to quote Mill but a little correctly! But

* See "Capital," French ed., p. 268.

† Professor Brentano had already remarked the incorrectness of his quotations in general.

he persecutes him as the author of "Inductive Logic"; he envies him for his universal glory. For instance, Marx read in J. Liebig that statement that Mill was the first to point out the favorable influence of husbandry on the fertility of the soil. Note well that Mill was a man of exceptional modesty. He not only did not accuse anyone of plagiarizing his ideas, as did Marx toward Rodbertus and even toward Lassalle, but he rendered himself famous by his tendency to attribute to others all the value of his works. He never claimed the paternity of the observation cited by Liebig. But Marx could not suffer that the least originality should be attributed to Mill. Hence, he undertakes a ridiculous research in order to prove by quotations that before J. S. Mill, Anderson, Malthus, West, James Mill spoke of that influence. Then he finishes:

"It is undeniabe that J. S. Mill owes to such mistakes *the authority, in every curious case,* which he enjoys."‡ What hatred! What black envy! For the benefit of those Marxists who so vaunt their parliamentary politics, I would say that J. S. Mill gained his universal authority by his works, and among others, for his defense of the interests of the working classes, to whom, before Marx, Engels, and others, he pointed out in his letter addressed to the trade unionist and internationalist Odger, the necessity of the parliamentary candidature of the proletariat as a class.

I am not writing an apology for J. S. Mill; if I pause a while on the character of the great English philosopher, it is with the pure aim of exposing the literary procedures of Marx. Still less apology is demanded on behalf of the great founder of political economy, of the "theory of value," on whom will depend all Socialists. I speak of Adam Smith, and of his theory of value based on labor.

We have seen how severe Marx was toward Mill, who had not given the authority for a mere secondary conclusion. Naturally, the reader is disposed to believe that Marx himself will never make a like mistake, and that all the laws and ideas formulated and emitted from him will be registered by him with rigorous exactitude. Let us look closely, and see if he was so correct in his quotations, even on a question so important and fundamental as the theory of value?

In the commencement of his introduction, Marx teaches doctorally that the first chapter of his work, in which he treats the theory of value, is the most important, and so difficult to understand that even men of great capacity, like Lassalle, cannot entirely seize his fundamental idea. This justice must be rendered to him: his exposition of the theory of value

‡ "Capital," p. 218.

is truly difficult to read and understand. His analysis is long, and wants clearness, his examples are encumbering, his quotations somewhat strange —yes, strange; in the first seventeen pages, in which he considers value as the product of human labor, quotations abound from Hegel, Pietro Verri, Trome, from an anonymous author, from Barbon, from the poet Butler, from Locke, and from Marx himself, in the first place, but none of these, save Marx, consider value as the product of labor.

Despite the difficulty, let us endeavor to resume his fundamental ideas on the subject. Let us always take his own expressions.

1. "The utility of a thing gives it a use value" (pp. 1-2).

2. "As use values, merchandise is before all of different quality, as exchange values can only be of a different quantity. The use value of a product once placed aside, it only possesses one more quality, that of being the product of labor" (p. 2).

3. "But the value of products represents purely the labor of man, an expenditure of human force in general" (p. 17).

4. "As the price of the 'value' of a product only represents the work contained in it, it follows that all products in a certain proportion must possess equal values" (p. 17).

Such are the fundamental ideas of "the theory of value" of Marx. Had no one before him the least idea of the rôle of creative labor? Presumably not, for in these seventeen pages, Marx, so prodigious in quotations, and so severe towards J. S. Mill, without doubt, would have mentioned any such author. However, let us see, for example, what Adam Smith says on labor. His great work, published a century before Marx's "Capital," the work which marks a whole epoch in the science and is cited by everybody, commences as follows:

1. "The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labor, or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations" ("Wealth of Nations," p. 1).

2. "The value of any commodity, therefore, to the person who possesses it, and who means not to use or consume it himself, but to exchange it for other commodities, is equal to the quantity of labor which it enables him to purchase or command" (p. 38).

3. "The real price of everything, what everything really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it" (idem).

4. "What is bought with money or with goods, is purchased by labor" (idem).

5. "Labor, therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities" (idem).

6. "Labor was the first price, the original purchase-money, that was paid for all things. It was not by gold or by silver, but by labor, that all the wealth of the world was originally purchased; and its value to those who possess it, and who want to exchange it for some new productions, is precisely equal to the quantity of labor which it can enable them to purchase or command" (idem).

7. "Labor alone, therefore, never varying in its own value, is alone the ultimate and real standard by which the value of all commodities can at all times and places be estimated and compared. It is their real price" (p. 40).

8. "Labor, therefore, it appears evidently, is the only universal as well as the only accurate measure of value, or the only standard by which we can compare the values of different commodities at all times and all places" (p. 43).

9. "The real value of all the different component parts of price, it must be observed, is measured by the quantity of labor which they can, each of them, purchase or command. Labor measures the value not only of that part of price which resolves itself into labor, but of that which resolves itself into rent, and of that which resolves itself into profit" (p. 53).

Need we continue these quotations? It is really admirable, this theory of value of Marx, so ill conceived by him, and so well expounded by Adam Smith a century before.

Is it possible, may be asked, that Marx, so severe toward J. S. Mill for a slight omission, has copied Adam Smith without mentioning where he has borrowed "his own" theory? In spite of all its monstrosity, the fact exists; in the first seventeen pages, in which he treats the question, Adam Smith is never mentioned. It is only on page eighteen that he cites the great English philosopher; it may be believed that he does so in order to render homage to his perspicuity and genius. Far from being so, he quotes Smith to war against him. Here is the quotation:—

"Equal quantities of labor must be at all times and in all places of an equal value for the laborer? Without entering into details, it will suffice to point out that A. Smith, after all his theory, gave this logical conclusion: 1. For a laborer eight and ten hours' work, always and everywhere, signifies the same quantity of expended muscular energy and intellectual capacity."

Marx warred against it, of course; each one has the right to think as he pleases; everyone has the right even to borrow the ideas of others; but no one has the right to appropriate them as his own.

REVOLUTIONARY CULTURE IS A RARE, RARE FLOWER WHICH, FROM TIME TO TIME, BEAUTIFIES OUR LIFE AND AROUSES HOPES IN THE HEART OF THE DOWN-TRODDEN HUMAN BEINGS. IN DEPTH IT EXPRESSES THE HUMAN LONGING FOR JUSTICE, EQUALITY, FREEDOM AND HAPPINESS. IT NEGATES THE ESTABLISHED VALUES, MORALITY AND HIERARCHIES, AND AIMS AT BREAKING THE CHAINS WHICH SUFFOCATE ALL HUMAN ASPIRATIONS AND BIND PEOPLE TO SLAVERY.

-Back copies of RED AND BLACK AVAILABLE.
BACK COPIES OF RED AND BLACK AVAILABLE.

IN THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT THERE CAN EXIST 2, 3, or 4 POLITICAL PARTIES BUT UNDER ONE CONDITION: ONE PARTY IN POWER, THE OTHERS -IN GAOLS. ONE WHO DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THAT, CANNOT GRASP THE IDEA OF THE BOLSHEVIK DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

Tomsky.

RED & BLACK

an anarchist journal No 15